



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,267	08/10/2001	Christopher D. Creech	018512-006510US	6230

20350 7590 04/10/2002

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

LI, RUIXIANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1646

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,267

Applicant(s)

CREECH ETAL.

Examiner

Ruixiang Li

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-9, 19, and 20, drawn to a nucleic acid, a vector, and a host cell, classified in class 536, subclass 23.5; and class 435, subclass 320.1, and 325.
 - II. Claim 10, drawn to a method of detecting a nucleic acid, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - III. Claims 11-16, drawn to polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - IV. Claim 17 and 18, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
 - V. Claims 21-34, drawn to a method for identifying a compound that increases or decreases ion flux through a cation channel, classified in class 436, subclass 501.
 - VI. Claim 35, drawn to a method for identifying a compound that increases or decreases ion flux through a cyclic nucleotide-gated cation channel comprising using a computer system, classification depends upon the structure of the compound.
 - VII. Claim 36, drawn to a method of modulating ion flux through a CNG cation channel, classified in class 436, subclass 501.
 - VIII. Claims 37 and 38 (both in part), drawn to a method of detecting the presence of CNG2B in human tissue comprising using CNG2B-specific antibodies, classified in class 436, subclass 501.

Art Unit: 1646

- IX. Claims 37 and 38 (both in part), drawn to a method of detecting the presence of CNG2B in human tissue comprising using CNG2B-specific oligonucleotide primers or CNG2B-nucleic acid probes, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- X. Claims 39 and 40, drawn to a method of screening for mutations of a human CNG2B gene in a computer system.

- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the following reasons. Inventions I, III, and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP §806.04, MPEP §808.01). In the instance case, the different inventions are drawn to completely different products, nucleic acids, polypeptides, and antibodies. These molecules have completely different structures and biological functions which are not interchangeable and which require non-cohesive searches and considerations.
- 3. Inventions II, V-X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP §806.04, MPEP §808.01). In the instance case the different inventions are drawn to completely different methods each having completely different method steps, using different compositions, and having completely different outcomes. First, the method of detecting a nucleic acid will not identify a compound that affects ion flux, will not provide information on modulating ion flux or screening for mutations of a human CNG2B in a computer system. Nor will it be able to detect the presence of CNG2B

protein. Secondly, the method for identifying a compound that affects ion flux will not be able to detect either a nucleic acid or a CNG2B protein, or to screen mutations of a human CNG2B gene. Third, methods of modulating ion flux or screening for mutation of a human CNG2B gene will not be able to identify a nucleic acid, to detect a polypeptide or to identify a compound affecting ion flux. Finally, the method of detecting CNG2B in human tissue comprising using CNG2B-specific antibodies have obviously different method procedures from the method of detecting CNG2B in human tissue comprising using CNG2B-specific primers or probes. Thus, all the methods are exclusive.

4. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The invention can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instance case, the nucleic acid may be used in a materially different process such as to produce polypeptides. For the same reason, Invention I is related to Inventions IX and X are related but distinct inventions.
5. Inventions III and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instance case, the polypeptide may

Art Unit: 1646

be used in a materially different process such as to immunize mice to produce antibodies. For the same reason, Invention III is related to Inventions VI-VIII but they are distinct inventions.

6. Inventions IV and VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instance case, the antibody may be used in a materially different process such as to purify proteins.
7. Invention I is an independent invention from Inventions V-VIII; Invention III is an independent invention from Inventions II, IX, and X; Invention IV is an independent invention from Inventions II-VII, IX, and X. The different inventions are drawn to distinct product and method inventions.
8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for a single group is not required for any other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
10. This application contains a claim (claim 5) directed to patentably distinct species: 10 primers as represented by SEQ ID NOS: 4-13. Should applicants elect Group I, applicants are also required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a pair of primers for

Art Unit: 1646

prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicants are advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicants will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02 (a).

Should applicants traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48 (b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be

Art Unit: 1646

accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48 (b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17 (I).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruixiang Li whose telephone number is (703) 306-0282. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, can be reached on (703) 308-6564. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to yvonne.eyler@uspto.gov.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Art Unit: 1646

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Ruixiang Li
Examiner
April 4, 2002

Elizabeth C. Kemmerer

ELIZABETH KEMMERER
PRIMARY EXAMINER